

## CHAPTER 7

### EVALUATION OF THE SIGNIFICANT VARIANTS

As noted in the Introduction, Paul Maas has said that the goal of textual criticism is “to produce a text as close as possible to the original.”<sup>1</sup> This assessment is probably valid for the textual criticism of most works, both ancient and modern, but many scholars question its validity for the text of the OT. The original text is not the only possible goal of the textual critic, who may be more interested in determining—or believe that all that is possible is to determine—the form of the text at a particular stage of its development. One factor that complicates the discussion of the “original text” of the OT is the nature of the growth of the biblical text from its earliest oral and written forms to its final form, which was accepted as authoritative. An overlap may exist between textual criticism and literary criticism if, after one form of a text began to be transmitted, the text was subjected to further revision, and this form was also transmitted. This problem, the problem of multiple editions of a text, will be discussed in the next section.

Given the complexity of historical development of the text, the textual criticism of the OT is anything but straightforward. Once the problem of multiple editions is solved (if possible), the goal towards which the textual critic strives can still vary according to theological, philosophical, and pragmatic factors. The confessional stance of the textual critic may play a role in determining which text is sought. For example, if one particular form of the text is considered authoritative (e.g., MT or V),<sup>2</sup> then more effort may be expended in attempting to reconstruct that form than the presumed original. If, on the other hand, one believes that the most authoritative form of the text is the original form, then one has more incentive to search for that original.<sup>3</sup> Yet another theological position, dogmatic majoritarianism, holds that that form of scripture that exists in the greatest numbers is the form that is authoritative.<sup>4</sup> One’s philosophical approach to the various extant texts can

---

<sup>1</sup>Maas, *Textual Criticism*, 1.

<sup>2</sup>MT, of course, is the official Bible of rabbinic Judaism, and the Council of Trent attributed a special status to V.

<sup>3</sup>In an extreme form of this view, the nineteenth century Princeton school advocated the “inerrancy of original autographs.” This outlook has been revived by modern fundamentalists.

<sup>4</sup>For the OT, that form would be MT, though not necessarily exactly in the form preserved in BHS. This view has its greatest impact on the textual criticism of the NT, where dogmatic majoritarianism holds to the authority of the so-called Majority Text, which is similar in type (but not identical) to the *Textus Receptus*. See Arthur L. Farstad and Zane C. Hodges, *The Greek New Testament According to the*

also affect one's text-critical preferences. Those textual critics who would probably consider themselves pluralistic in outlook tend to have a greater appreciation, and interest, in those texts used in all of the various faith communities. Some might even suggest that reconstruction of other, hypothetical texts is irrelevant. Others whose interests are more particularistic might find only those forms of the text used by certain communities (e.g., rabbinic Judaism or "orthodox" Christianity) to be relevant. Finally, pragmatists might insist that since forms of the text not directly reflected in extant witnesses cannot be reconstructed with any scientific certainty, conjectural emendation should be studiously avoided. Other, more idealistic, textual critics, while recognizing the abuses of the past, might continue to stress the need for well-reasoned conjectures that clarify difficult passages (*cruces interpretum*) or explain the origin of anomalous readings.

These factors—and others besides—all play a role in determining the textual critic's goals. Even those textual critics who want to go beyond extant text-traditions and reconstruct some earlier form of the text do not all seek the same end. Some scholars see textual criticism as a means of restoring the original text. Though this goal is probably tacit in the minds of many people who are not experts in the field and explicit in the minds of most of those who hold to some doctrine of inerrancy, the lack of early Hebrew witnesses to much of the OT, the uncertainties involved in the methodological use of the versions, and the problem of determining which literary form should be considered original (especially when multiple editions exist) make the search for the original text problematic at best and dubious at worst.<sup>5</sup> Other scholars believe that textual criticism should produce the

---

*Majority Text* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1982).

<sup>5</sup>Cf. the discussion of the "original" text by Eugene Ulrich, "Double Literary Editions of Biblical Narratives and Reflections on Determining the Form to Be Translated," in *Perspectives on the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Walter J. Harrelson*, ed. James L. Crenshaw (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988), 113-14. See also Emanuel Tov, "The Original Shape of the Biblical Text," in *Congress Volume: Leuven 1989*, ed. J. A. Emerton, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, no. 43 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1991), 355-56, who offers what he calls a "moderate formulation" of the idea of the original text. His definition deserves to be quoted at length:

At the end of the process of composition of the biblical books stood at least one entity (a tradition or single copy) which was completed at the literary level. Possibly at one point parallel compositions were created as well, but they are not evidenced, and in any event, textual criticism takes into consideration only the literary composition that has been accepted as authoritative in Judaism. Even if we assume a very complicated literary development, at some time that process was ended. At the end of that process stood a finished literary product which at the same time stood at the beginning of a process of copying and textual transmission. . . . This entity forms the textual source aimed at by textual criticism, even if that aim can be accomplished in some details only. Reference to the originality of details in the texts pertains to this entity and not to an earlier or later literary stage. Its date differs from book to book and usually cannot be determined. For textual criticism this entity thus forms the "original" text, though in a moderate formulation, since it was preceded by oral and written stages.

Tov's placement of the term "original" in quotes shows the dubiety of the term if taken literally. More significant is his choice of the "literary composition that has been accepted as authoritative in Judaism." This choice, of course, is a theological one, and all textual critics may not agree with it (cf. Ulrich,

best possible text. Of course, those who are looking for the original text consider that the best text, but even those who despair of the search for the original text may speak of the best reading in a certain context. However, “best” is a subjective term; what seems best to a modern textual critic may not have seemed best to earlier generations. For example, scribes who “corrected” their copies of LXX to make them more closely resemble Attic Greek may have produced better texts in some sense, but probably no modern textual critic would agree with the qualitative assessment of those scribes. Furthermore, some readings that are patently ungrammatical or obscure may be the very readings sought by the textual critic, but “best” hardly seems the way to describe these readings. It seems preferable, then, for textual critics to seek the earliest possible reading, and to use this terminology in place of references to the “original” or “best” text or readings. “Earliest” is a more inclusive term than either of the other two, yet it surely encompasses the goals of those would seek both the “original” reading (what could be earlier than the original reading?) and the “best” reading (the earliest possible reading should usually explain the existence of the other readings). The various readings to be analyzed in this chapter will be evaluated from the standpoint of finding the earliest possible set of readings that is possible to reconstruct on the basis of the evidence. Even the search for the earliest reading has its problems, however, particularly when one deals with the possibility of multiple literary editions. It is to this possibility that the discussion will now turn.

### The Problem of Multiple Editions

Eugene Ulrich defines “multiple literary editions” as “a literary unit—a story, pericope, narrative, poem, book, etc.—appearing in two or more parallel forms (whether by chance extant or no longer extant in the textual witnesses), which one author, major redactor, or major editor completed and which a subsequent redactor or editor intentionally changed to a sufficient extent that the resultant form should be called a revised edition of that text.”<sup>6</sup> That multiple editions of some biblical books exist is proved by a simple comparison of the books of Daniel and Esther in Catholic and Protestant Bibles. The versions translated in Catholic Bibles are significantly longer and have additional material not found in the Protestant Bibles. The reason for these differences lies in the fact that the Catholic versions of these books are basically translations of LXX, whereas Protestant Bibles rely on the overall form of the text preserved in MT. Other examples of multiple literary editions of OT books which are preserved in the extant witnesses include Jeremiah

---

“Double Literary Editions,” 114-15).

<sup>6</sup>Eugene Ulrich, “The Canonical Process and Textual Criticism,” in *“Shā‘arei Talmon”: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, ed. Michael Fishbane, Emanuel Tov, and Weston W. Fields (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 278. For an early discussion of the relationship of textual criticism and literary criticism, see Talmon, “Textual Study of the Bible,” 327-32.

and Ezekiel.<sup>7</sup>

Ulrich identifies four different types of intentional variant editions of sections of the OT. In the book of Exodus, MT and LXX preserve an earlier form of the text, while 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> has an edition based on this earlier form, but expanded by multiple harmonizations throughout the book. In Jeremiah, the earlier form testified to by LXX and 4QJer<sup>b</sup> is rearranged and systematically expanded by numerous small additions in MT and 4QJer<sup>a,c</sup>. Daniel 4-6 in MT and LXX (OG) expand an earlier, now lost, common ancestor in different directions. Finally, he notes that in the story of David and Goliath in 1 Samuel 16-18, MT supplements the earlier form of the text preserved in LXX with diverse traditions about David. Furthermore, he suggests, more hesitantly, that LXX may have in 1 Samuel 1-2 an intentionally altered portrait of Hannah, Elkanah, and the events surrounding Samuel's birth.<sup>8</sup>

It is his observations concerning Samuel that are most relevant to the current study. That the story of David and Goliath in MT and LXX represent different literary editions is indisputable, but is this pericope an isolated example of literary activity subsequent to the completion of the book in substantially its final form,<sup>9</sup> or is there evidence of editorial activity in other passages? Answers to this query come from two different directions. The first is the study of Stanley D. Walters on 1 Samuel 1 in MT and LXX (ms B).<sup>10</sup> Walters contends that MT and LXX are "discrete narratives, each with its own *Tendenz*."<sup>11</sup> Moreover, he says,

I doubt that there ever was an original text which has given rise—by known processes of transmission—to the two stories M[T] and B [LXX]. The present MS evidence attests alternate traditions—perhaps prophetic and priestly—rather than a series of successive variations on a single tradition.<sup>12</sup>

Specifically, whereas MT stresses the joint activity of Hannah and Elkanah in making the sacrifice after Samuel's birth and in presenting him to Eli, LXX makes Hannah dependent on her husband for all her actions.<sup>13</sup>

Reactions to Walters's analysis have been mixed. Though he disagrees with some

<sup>7</sup>See, e.g., Emanuel Tov, "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History," in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay, pp. 211-37 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985); Johan Lust, ed., *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, no. 74 (Leuven: University Press, 1986).

<sup>8</sup>Ulrich, "Canonical Process and Textual Criticism," 278-86, esp. 285-86. See also idem, "Double Literary Editions," 103-8.

<sup>9</sup>The insertion of John 7:53-8:11 into its present place in the Gospel of John in many mss is an example of an isolated insertion unrelated to further literary activity.

<sup>10</sup>Walters, "Hannah and Anna," 385-412.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., 409.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., 410.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., 408-9.

specifics of Walters's arguments, Ulrich agrees with "his general conclusion that, as I would rephrase it, in 1 Samuel 1 the MT and the LXX (in basic fidelity to its Hebrew *Vorlage*) may well present two different editions of the text, one intentionally different from the other, each internally consistent."<sup>14</sup> Tov explicitly rejects the notion of different pristine texts of Samuel, believing instead that the readings in the various extant witnesses are genetically related.<sup>15</sup> However, he leaves open the possibility that 1 Samuel 16-18 is part of a larger revision of the whole text of Samuel, a possibility that must be considered especially when LXX has a significantly shorter text.<sup>16</sup> Johann Cook also disputes the notion of independent texts in 1 Samuel 1-2. In a study of 1 Sam 1:28 and 2:11, Cook concludes that the variant versions of MT and LXX are based on an earlier (Hebrew) version that excluded the Song of Hannah.<sup>17</sup> The possibility of separate literary editions of 1 Samuel 1-2 cannot be said to have been ruled out, but neither has it been satisfactorily demonstrated.

In addition to the proposals of Walters concerning 1 Samuel 1, many scholars posit two or more separate editions of the entire Deuteronomistic History.<sup>18</sup> For example, Richard D. Nelson, who sees two distinct editions, says that the first edition was composed by a true historian during the reign of Josiah, and the second was revised by an editor early in the exile.<sup>19</sup> Even if the analyses of Nelson and others are accurate, their relevance for the text-critical study of Samuel is problematic. In the first place, scholars find few Deuteronomistic intrusions in the books of Samuel, particularly after 1 Samuel 12.<sup>20</sup> Secondly, no correlation has been shown to exist between the earlier edition of the Deuteronomistic History and any textual witness; all the witnesses testify to the final, exilic edition. There are certainly substantial differences between MT and LXX,

<sup>14</sup>Ulrich, "Canonical Process and Textual Criticism," 281.

<sup>15</sup>Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 173-76. In particular, he denies that MT and LXX offer independent traditions in 1 Sam 1:23, as Walters proposes (*ibid.*, 176; S. D. Walters, "Hannah and Anna," 410-12).

<sup>16</sup>Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 346-47.

<sup>17</sup>Johann Cook, "Hannah and/or Elkanah on Their Way Home (1 Samuel 2:11)? A Witness to the Complexity of the Tradition History of the Samuel Texts," *Old Testament Essays* 3 (1990): 253-54.

<sup>18</sup>See, e.g., Helga Weippert, "Die 'deuteronomistischen' Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher," *Biblica* 53 (1972): 301-39; Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1973), 274-89; Richard D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 18 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981).

<sup>19</sup>Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 42 and *passim*.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, 14. Cf. also Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 2 vols., trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, 1962-65), 346: "For a long stretch after the end of the Deuteronomistic Book of Judges in I Sam. XII the Deuteronomist's interpreting hand abandons us, and only again comes into action with the story of Solomon (I Kings III)."

for example, in the books of Kings, including differences in the chronology of the kings and significant differences in content and order of the narratives.<sup>21</sup> Differences exist between MT and LXX in Joshua and Judges, too.<sup>22</sup> It remains to be demonstrated convincingly that such a pattern of differences exists between the witnesses of Samuel. The evaluation of 1 Samuel 3 shows no conclusive evidence of differences on the literary level, though it has been suggested that the long addition in 3:21 and 4:1 in LXX may be the result of literary and not just textual differences.<sup>23</sup> In view of the lack of evidence at this point of different editions in chapter 3, the variants there will be treated as purely textual variants. However, the matter of separate editions will have to be addressed once again when verse 21 is evaluated.

### Conjectural Emendations

The term “emendation” is used in at least four different ways by scholars. First, some scholars refer to any reading retroverted from one of the secondary versions as an emendation. However, since evidence of the reading does occur in an extant text-tradition, the term “retroverted reading” is more appropriate. Second, any change to the Masoretic vocalization or accents can be called an emendation, especially if it is not supported by one of the versions (and so is not a retroverted reading). Since the goal of this thesis is to reconstruct a purely consonantal text, such emendations are irrelevant to the task at hand. Similarly, philological emendations that involve no change in the consonantal text but only the recognition of a new root related to a cognate language or of a newly discovered grammatical structure are largely irrelevant to the present discussion, since they do not affect the consonantal text. In this study, the term “emendation” will refer only to proposed or accepted readings that (1) require a change in the consonantal text (including changes in word division, since it is likely that the earliest forms of the text used some means of separating words), and (2) are not documented in the extant witnesses.<sup>24</sup>

Scholars of earlier generations resorted to conjectural emendation of their text quite

---

<sup>21</sup> See, e.g., Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development*, Ralph W. Klein, “Archaic Chronologies and the Textual History of the Old Testament,” *Harvard Theological Review* 67 (1974): 255-63; Julio C. Trebolle Barrera, *Jehú y Joás: Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9-11*, Institución San Gerónimo, no. 17 (Valencia: Edilva, 1984); Baruch Halpern and David S. Vanderhooft, “The Editions of Kings in the 7th-6th Centuries B.C.E.,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 62 (1991): 179-244.

<sup>22</sup> See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 327-32, 344-45, and the bibliographies there.

<sup>23</sup> So Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 1:152; but contrast the explanations in McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 97; R. W. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 30. See also below, 268-70, where further possible evidence of literary differences is discussed.

<sup>24</sup> This definition of emendation is substantially the same as that of Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 351-53. Tov identifies three different types of emendations: contextual emendations, linguistic emendations, and emendations for metrical reasons (*ibid.*, 357-69). These types of emendations are not distinguished in this study.

frequently, with what many modern scholars would call reckless abandon. In reaction to their excesses, some moderns have eschewed the practice altogether.<sup>25</sup> Others have for the most part tried to maintain the consonantal text of MT (with the exception of *matres lectionis*) and to solve textual difficulties on the basis of comparative philology.<sup>26</sup> Still others advocate the continued judicious use of conjectural emendations.<sup>27</sup> It is this last approach which is followed in the present thesis, for at least three reasons. First, emendation is a recognized part of the text-critical process, whether one is examining biblical, classical, medieval, or modern texts.<sup>28</sup> Second, the MT of Samuel is patently poor in comparison with other books.<sup>29</sup> Third, it seems methodologically improper to exclude or limit the use of conjectures in advance. To quote Albrektson, “[when one encounters a difficult reading,] two possible explanations must be compared: is a particular difficulty due to an error in the textual transmission or to a linguistic anomaly, puzzling but explicable? The answer cannot be given in advance, and the possibilities must be considered on equal terms.”<sup>30</sup>

#### Guidelines for Evaluating Variants

Once the various original and reconstructed Hebrew variants are assembled, how are they to be evaluated? The text-critical value of a certain variant may be measured according to two different sets of criteria, external and internal. External criteria include the evaluation of a variant on the basis of the age or presumed worth of the witnesses

<sup>25</sup>For example, the Committee for the Textual Analysis of the Hebrew Old Testament expresses extreme reservations about making conjectures because of the danger of corrupting the text still further. In addition, they are concerned that some conjectures may restore a precanonical form of the text (e.g., the text of J in the Pentateuch) rather than the text of the final redactor. See Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 1:74-77.

<sup>26</sup>The most famous proponent of this method was surely Mitchell Dahood, though many others have also used the method. See, e.g., Mitchell Dahood, “The Value of Ugaritic for Textual Criticism,” *Biblica* 40 (1959): 160-70; idem, “Ebla, Ugarit, and the Bible,” Afterword to *The Archives of Ebla: An Empire Inscribed in Clay*, by Giovanni Pettinato (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1981), 271-321. For a critique of abuses of this method, see Barr, *Comparative Philology*.

<sup>27</sup>Bertil Albrektson, “Difficilior Lectio Probabilior: A Rule of Textual Criticism and Its Use in Old Testament Studies,” in *Remembering All the Way . . . : A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Fortieth Anniversary of the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland*, ed. A. S. van der Woude, Oudtestamentische Studiën, no. 21 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981), 14-17; Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 351-69.

<sup>28</sup>Maas, *Textual Criticism*, 11-17. Although noting the difficulties involved with many emendations, he comments, “It is far more dangerous for a corruption to pass unrecognized than for a sound text to be unjustifiably attacked” (p. 17).

<sup>29</sup>Numerous scholars and commentators could be cited who hold similar opinions, including S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, xxxv-xxxvi; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 5; and Harry Meyer Orlinsky, “The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, ed. George Ernest Wright, 113-32 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1961), 150.

<sup>30</sup>Albrektson, “Difficilior Lectio Probabilior,” 16.

containing it, the number of witnesses containing the variant, the geographical distribution of the variant, and the distribution of the variant among different text-types or local texts. A comparison of the methods of textual critics of the OT and the NT reveals an interesting phenomenon: whereas most NT textual critics put a fairly heavy emphasis on external criteria, most OT textual critics do not.<sup>31</sup> One group of OT scholars that sees value in some types of external evidence might be called the American, or perhaps the Albright, school. These scholars are influenced by Albright's proposal that divergent local texts of the Hebrew Bible emerged in various locations (Albright suggested Babylonia, Palestine, and Egypt). The clearest expression of this position is Frank M. Cross's article on the theory of local texts.<sup>32</sup> Cross's theory is an amplification not only of Albright's work, but also of that of Barthélemy.<sup>33</sup> According to the theory of local texts, three distinct textual families can be discerned in the witnesses of Samuel. A reading that appears in two of the local texts has a greater possibility of being original than one that appears in only one local text.<sup>34</sup> A related external phenomenon is the occurrence of related readings in witnesses from different text-traditions, such as the agreements of LXX with P, LXX with a reading from the apocrypha or rabbinic literature, or LXX with Masoretic mss that sometimes preserve significant readings.<sup>35</sup> Connected with this phenomenon is the question of whether variants in one witness that have been judged nonsignificant should play a role in the evaluation of a parallel significant reading in another witness, a question that has already been addressed above (pp. 199-200), where it was decided that, though the nonsignificant readings should be considered, they should in no way be accorded the same value as significant variants. The issue of how such agreements between significant and nonsignificant variants should be represented in the critical apparatus is addressed below.

External considerations do play some role in evaluating variant readings, but internal factors are more important.<sup>36</sup> Numerous rules and guidelines have been developed

---

<sup>31</sup>For an overview of the two major approaches to NT textual criticism, rigorous (thoroughgoing) eclecticism and rational (modified) eclecticism, see above, 13-15, and, in greater detail, Brooks, "The Text of the New Testament and Biblical Authority," 19-20. For a more extensive comparison of textual criticism as practiced by OT and NT textual critics, see James R. Adair, "Old and New in Textual Criticism: Similarities, Differences, and Prospects for Cooperation," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 1 (1996).

<sup>32</sup>Cross, "Theory of Local Texts," 306-20.

<sup>33</sup>Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant," 18-29; idem, *devanciers d'Aquila*. See also R. W. Klein, *Textual Criticism*, 69-73; Ulrich, *Qumran Text of Samuel*, 4-9.

<sup>34</sup>Cf. Cross, "Theory of Local Texts," 317, n. 11. Of course, a reading that appears in two local texts is not necessarily original, particularly if those two are the Palestinian and the Egyptian texts, which share a common ancestor, according to the theory. The point here is only that scholars that hold to this theory put greater emphasis on external factors than do other scholars.

<sup>35</sup>See the discussion of this "zeer gecompliceerde vraagstukken" in Seeligmann, "Problemen en perspectieven," 382-84.

<sup>36</sup>McCarter, *Textual Criticism*, 71-72, outlines the hazards of using external criteria when



to assist the textual critic in his or her decision-making process. Examples of such guidelines include preference for the shorter readings, preference for the more difficult reading, preference for the reading more consistent with the author's vocabulary and style, and consideration given to possible mechanical errors (e.g., parablepsis [homoioleuton and homoioarkton], dittography, haplography).<sup>37</sup> As long as these suggestions are seen as guidelines or helps, they can be of benefit, particularly to the beginning student. However, the idea that they are fixed rules should be avoided, since every case must be considered individually, and many factors often come into play.<sup>38</sup> As Tov notes, "the quintessence of textual criticism is to select from the different transmitted readings the *one* reading which is the most appropriate in the context."<sup>39</sup> The emphasis on *one* reading is especially important when one is attempting to produce a critical text, as will be done in the following chapter. The following section may be considered a commentary on that critical text.

#### Evaluations of the Variants

The reading of MT is given as a collating base for each verse. The variant readings from the secondary witnesses are then grouped into units that will be considered together. Instead of repeating the entire retroversion of each verse (these retroversions are taken from the previous chapter), only those parts of the verse necessary for the collation will be listed, following the reading of MT. To this point, only variants in the secondary witnesses have been discussed to any extent, since variants in the primary witnesses are by definition

---

evaluating readings. Particularly important is his observation that a reading from a ms with a preponderance of better readings should not automatically be preferred to a reading from a generally inferior ms. If one had some assurance that one ms was accurate ninety percent of the time and another only seventy percent of the time, then one could justifiably rely on the more accurate ms except in the case of obvious errors. However, since such an assurance would of necessity come from outside the ms itself, and since the quality of a ms in the first place is determined by *internal* considerations, the critic has no reason to believe that the reading from the one ms has a greater probability of being correct than that from the other, just because previous readings of the first ms have been better.

One possible exception to this characterization of the value of external evidence exists, however. McCarter correctly notes that "the *stemma* of the biblical text is extremely intricate, and its various lines of transmission are not distinct and independent" (ibid., 71). Nevertheless, *if* a partial stemma can be reconstructed, as Cross's local text theory attempts to do, parallel non-trivial variants in unrelated sources should be considered—at least as evidence that the reading originated in Hebrew—alongside internal evidence. In addition, if the internal evidence provides no clues whatsoever to the older reading, some external factor will have to be used to decide which variant to print in the critical text.

<sup>37</sup>Cf. R. W. Klein, *Textual Criticism*, 73-83; McCarter, *Textual Criticism*, 26-61; Deist, *Text of the OT*, 38-50; Würthwein, *Text of OT*, 106-10; Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 236-84. Alongside these lists of guidelines, discussions of scribal habits are also informative. See especially Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, passim; Shemaryahu Talmon, "DSIa As a Witness to Ancient Exegesis of the Book of Isaiah," *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 1 (1962): 62-72; idem, "Textual Transmission of the Bible," 95-132.

<sup>38</sup>See the discussion in Emanuel Tov, "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitations of Textual Rules," *Harvard Theological Review* 75 (1982): 429-48.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., 444-45 (italics his).

significant and require no retroversion; all Hebrew variants, whether from primary witnesses or retroverted from secondary witnesses, will be discussed below.

The sigla in the collations are consistent with those used in Chapter 2 above. The reading of the base text (MT) will be given first, followed by a large right bracket ‘]’. If more than one such reading occurs in the verse, the one in question will be identified by a numeral followed by a small superscript *o*: ‘1<sup>o</sup>’, ‘2<sup>o</sup>’, and so forth. Next, the variant reading(s) will each be given (retroverted, if necessary), along with the witnesses that support the reading. Each of the variants following the base reading will be separated from the previous one by a vertical bar ‘|’. Witnesses will be listed in the following order: primary (Hebrew) witnesses,<sup>40</sup> secondary witnesses, partial secondary witnesses, conjectures (abbreviated ‘cj’, followed by the names of scholars or Bible versions that propose or accept the conjecture). Witnesses that support a reading in most respects (or the most important respects) but differ in small details will be enclosed in parentheses ‘()’. Next, the symbols ‘+’ and ‘>’ represent an addition and an omission with respect to the base text, respectively. The abbreviations ‘pr’ and ‘post’ mean that the variant precedes or follows the word or phrase given as the base text, respectively. A superscripted *vid* means that one may infer the reading from the witness, though it does not explicitly contain it (e.g., as a result of a lacuna), and a superscripted *mss* following the abbreviation of a witness refers to a reading that is not the main rendering within the text-tradition. Finally, nonsignificant variants cited in support of a significant variant in one of the secondary witnesses will be printed in smaller type following the significant reading (e.g., if the reading of LXX is significant and the readings of P and V, while agreeing with LXX, are nonsignificant, that part of the collation would read: LXX P V). No attempt will be made to cite every nonsignificant variant that agrees with a significant variant. An asterisk ‘\*’ following a reading indicates that it is the one that will be printed as the base text in the critical edition of 1 Samuel 3 given in the next chapter. If no asterisk appears next to any reading, the discussion of that unit of variation should be read for an explanation.

(3:1) והנער שמואל משרת את יהוה לפני עלי ודבר יהוה היה יקר בימים ההם  
אין חזון נפרץ

LXX P הכהן + ]\*עלי

הכהן is probably an explanatory addition to the text, perhaps based on 2:11 (cf. 1:9). The reading of P might reflect the influence of LXX; if so, the reading might be

<sup>40</sup>Especially Masoretic mss 70, 89, 174, 187; 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, where extant; *kethib* or *qere*, cited as K and Q, respectively; and *tiqqune sopherim*, cited as *tiq soph*. Other Masoretic mss may occasionally be cited in support of significant readings, though their readings are not considered significant, as indicated by the smaller font size used in the references.

secondary in P, though it is preserved in all extant mss. However, it is also possible that the translators added the word independently. It is almost certainly secondary.

P יהוה יקר היה [\*יהוה היה יקר]

Although it is possible that the verb is secondary in all the traditions, it is probable that this variant arose as a result of graphic similarity between יהיה and יהוה, causing the verb to be omitted accidentally, only to be replaced later in the wrong place (perhaps as a result of being written in the margin). In addition to the argument from graphic confusion (which would not have occurred had the order supposed in P been original), normal Hebrew idiom seems to favor the medial position of the verb.

LXX \*פרץ] נפרץ

The נ in נפרץ could have arisen as a result of dittography from the previous נ in חזון. On the other hand, one could argue that the נ was omitted as a result of haplography. It is probable that the translators of LXX had before them the reading פרץ, which they took as a qal active participle, but which in fact was probably a qal passive participle. Though the niph'al and the qal passive have identical meanings here, the ambiguity of the form without נ and the relative infrequency of qal passives in the OT might have led a scribe to insert the נ of the niph'al, either to clarify the meaning, or perhaps under the false assumption that it had accidentally fallen out of the text. The reading reflected in LXX, then, is to be preferred, though only by a small amount.

(3:2) ויהי ביום ההוא ועלי שכב במקמו ועינו החלו כהות לא יוכל לראות

89 > [\*החלו]

The omission of החלו in ms 89 is surely secondary, resulting either from accidental haplography (perhaps aided by the common ending ו- in החלו and ועיניו [kethib in ms 89]) or from the difficulty involved with pointing כהות as an adjective.

LXX P כבוד] \*כהות

The renderings of LXX (βαρυνεσθα) and P (כבוד) suggest the possibility that their respective *Vorlagen* read כבוד. This possibility is far from certain, even in LXX, where the variant was considered significant. Thus, to replace the rendering of MT as the probable earlier reading, the case for כבוד should be strong. However, the evidence is at best a toss-up. Although both readings make good sense in the context and are idiomatic, כבוד is the more commonly used word, and a scribe might have wanted to replace the less

common כהות with the familiar כבוד. When this observation is coupled with the uncertainty concerning the retroversion, the reading of MT remains preferable.

ולא\*] 187 LXX P T

The additional conjunction in many witnesses is natural in the context and smooths out what might have been felt to be a rough spot in the flow of the narrative. On the other hand, the absence of a conjunction serves to stress Eli's blindness (perhaps more than mere physical blindness<sup>41</sup>). Scribes who were not sensitive to the nuances of the text might have inserted a conjunction that they felt belonged there. It is less likely that a scribe would have purposely deleted an existing conjunction, though the possibility of accidental omission is certainly not remote. All in all, the reading of MT seems more likely to have been the earlier reading.

יוכלו\*] 187 LXX<sup>mss</sup>

By reading a plural instead of a singular, the variant exhibited in ms 187 and in several mss of LXX shifts the subject of the verb from Eli himself to his eyes. While such a reading does fit the context, it seems more likely that Eli is the intended subject, rather than his eyes. If overtones of spiritual blindness are present in the verse, it is surely Eli who would be criticized and not his eyes. Thus, the reading of MT is preferable.

70 כהות לראות\*] לראות

The reading of ms 70 at this point is a misplaced dittography; it is clearly secondary.

(3:3) ונר אלהים טרם יכבה ושמואל שכב בהיכל יהוה אשר שם ארון אלהים

P יהוה] 1°\* אלהים

The phrase נר אלהים does not appear again in the OT, and the phrase נר יהוה occurs only at Prov 20:27. The shift from אלהים to יהוה could have occurred in Hebrew as easily as the shift from אלא to נו in Syriac. It is true, however, that the Syriac translators, perhaps under the influence of T, do occasionally show some tendency to have נו when אלא would be expected on the basis of MT. Of greater significance is the parallel between נר אלהים at the beginning of the verse and ארון אלהים at the end. Anticipating a textual evaluation later in this same verse, the absence of

<sup>41</sup>Gnuse, *Dream Theophany*, 152; for a different interpretation of Eli's blindness, see Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist*, 52-54.

יהוה in the verse (in the critical text) makes the reading of MT somewhat more likely from a stylistic perspective.

LXX<sup>O</sup> 96 ]בהיכל\*

The reference to the temple in Shiloh apparently caused some tradents of the text difficulty. Since Solomon's temple was not yet constructed, some scribes apparently thought the term היכל was inappropriate, preferring instead a term that did not connote the Jerusalem temple (so also mss of MT and P in 1 Sam 1:9). It is probable, however, that היכל is in fact the more ancient reading.

LXX ]בהיכל יהוה

LXX omits the word יהוה after היכל, and one must immediately consider whether the word might be an addition to the text in MT. Though the term does add specificity, there is no doubt that the temple in question was dedicated to Yahweh. However, it is possible that a scribe might have felt the need to emphasize the fact; on the other hand, the word might have been added inadvertently because of the frequency of the phrase יהוה היכל in the OT (cf. 1 Sam 1:9; 2 Kgs 18:16; 23:4; 24:13; Jer 7:4 [*ter*], etc.). Yet another possibility is that היכל and בית יהוה in LXX<sup>O</sup> and ms 96 were substitutional variants and that יהוה היכל is the result of conflation. In any case, it is likely that יהוה is secondary here.

] יהוה אשר שם ארון אל הים > 4QSam<sup>avid</sup>

4QSam<sup>a</sup> has a lacuna at this point, but based on letter counts, it probably had a text that was about twenty characters shorter than that of MT. Ulrich and McCarter have postulated the omission not only of יהוה but also of the rest of the verse. Although this supposition is as likely as any, it is impossible to be certain about it. It seems best, then, to omit only יהוה, with LXX (see previous unit of variation).

89 האל הים ]2°\* אל הים

Ms 89 has an article attached to אל הים, a reading which is equivalent, though less common. Nevertheless, the reading with the article is not compelling, so the reading of the majority of Masoretic mss will be retained.

(3:4) ויקרא יהוה אל שמואל ויאמר הנני

LXX שמואל שמואל | 4QSam<sup>a</sup> שמן ואל שמואל? ] אל שמואל

A discussion of these variants is reserved for later (see below, pp. 270-72).

(3:5) וירץ אל עלי ויאמר הנני כי קראת לי ויאמר לא קראתי שוב שכב וילך  
וישכב

P<sup>mss</sup> אלך or לך + LXX אלך | 187 לך + P<sup>mss</sup> 70mg בני + ] \*קראתי

The additional word בני is probably the result of harmonization with verse 6, though it may have arisen independently. Either way, it is probably secondary. As for the prepositional phrase, the context of verse 5 certainly supports its presence, but it does not require it. The addressee in the more concise statement of MT is equally clear. It is likely, then, that the prepositional phrase is a contextual addition.

LXX וישב ] וילך

A discussion of this unit of variation is reserved for later (see below, 270-72).

(3:6) ויסף יהוה קרא עוד שמואל ויקם שמואל וילך אל עלי ויאמר הנני כי  
קראת לי ויאמר לא קראתי בני שוב שכב

LXX<sup>L</sup> יהוה עוד קרא | LXX \*יהוה ויקרא | P עוד יהוה קרא ] יהוה קרא עוד

All these variants revolve around the placement—or existence—of the temporal adverb עוד (the additional conjunction and different verb form in LXX will be considered below). The order of the words יהוה קרא remains constant in every witness, but עוד appears in every possible place: before, between, and after יהוה and קרא, and it is also absent in one tradition. The accidental addition, omission, or transposition of the adverb does not change the meaning of the sentence, since ויסף specifies repetitive action. Furthermore, the present verse is not the only one in which עוד or its equivalent moves around in the witnesses (cf. 3:8 P V LXX<sup>O</sup>; 3:9 LXX<sup>mss</sup>; 3:21 P). The omission of the word in LXX (combined with a change in the sentence structure in LXX, to be discussed in the next section) and the varied placement of עוד in the other witnesses lead one to suspect that the form now found in LXX is the earliest form.

LXX \*ויקרא ] קרא

Both readings are acceptable Hebrew constructions, though the reading of MT is

both more common and present in the immediate context (3:8 all witnesses). That readings of the type found in LXX are not foreign to the idiom of Samuel can be seen from 1 Sam 19:21; 2 Sam 18:22. It is probable that the original form found in the *Vorlage* of LXX was changed during the transmission of MT to reflect the more common idiom, which was also present in the context. However, the possibility that LXX here reflects a different literary stage than MT cannot be ruled out, though the evidence is inconclusive at this point. This issue will be taken up further below.

70 ויאמר הנני + ]1° שמואל

The phrase ויאמר הנני in ms 70 is almost certainly an imitation of Samuel's actions in 3:4, so the reading of MT is to be preferred.

LXX שמואל + ]1° שמואל

A discussion of this unit of variation is reserved for later (see below, 270-72).

LXX 89 187 > ]\*ויקם שמואל

One could argue that the longer reading of MT is a later insertion designed to make the present verse more closely resemble verse 8. However, the immediately preceding verse lacks any reference to Samuel arising, and no attempts to correct that verse exist. It is more likely that the omission of ויקם שמואל is due to parablepsis in either Hebrew or Greek from "Samuel" to "Samuel." The same error could have occurred independently in the Hebrew witnesses on the one hand and LXX on the other, though some sort of genetic connection cannot be ruled out. In either case, the longer reading of MT is to be preferred.

174 > ]2° שמואל\*

The missing שמואל after ויקם in ms 174 could have developed from either the longer or the shorter text of the previous unit of variation. If the reading was based on the majority MT, שמואל might have dropped out as a result of haplography. If the reading was based on the shorter text, ויקם might have been inserted either from verse 8 or from memory of other mss. If the evaluation of the preceding unit of variation is correct, then the reading of ms 174 is probably not original, since the opportunity for parablepsis would no longer be present. The reading of the majority of Masoretic mss should be retained.

LXX שנית + ]\*עלי

The word שנית functions in LXX similarly to the way in which עוד functions earlier in the verse in most other witnesses: it distinguishes the second call of Samuel from

the first. Even without these additions, the two descriptions are not identical. Nevertheless, scribes apparently felt some need to differentiate the incidents further. שנייה has a stronger rhetorical impact than עוד, and its addition may be seen as an attempt by the tradents of the *Vorlage* of LXX<sup>42</sup> more sharply to distinguish the second call from the first. שנייה may be compared with בשלשית in verse 8, which may have inspired the addition in verse 6. Since שנייה appears to be an attempted improvement of the text, and since no reason for deleting the word were it original is apparent, the reading of MT here seems preferable.

70 ואמר ] 2°\* ויאמר

The reading of ms 70 is a clear error caused by haplography.

LXX קראתי אלך | 70\* קראתי ] קראתי בני

This unit of variation is similar to one of the units of variation in verse 5 (see above, p. 148). The witnesses supporting one reading or another have changed, but the reasons for accepting the shortest reading remain the same, notwithstanding the fact that the shortest reading appears only in ms 70. It is uncertain whether ms 70 is genetically related to what is probably an older reading, or whether it is simply a correction to the preceding verse. Regardless of which possibility is true, the variation between בני and אלך in the witnesses suggests that neither is original.

70 ] + וישכב + וילך + whole verse (repeated) \*ישכב

The repetition of וילך וישכב from verse 5 and the entirety of verse 6 in ms 70 is apparently the result of a form of parablepsis in which the scribes eye skipped from שכב שוב at the end of verse 6 *up* to the same words at the end of verse 5. Whether the deviations from the majority MT present in the first rendition of the verse are also present in the second is not indicated in Kennicott's apparatus. If not, preservation of variant readings may also have been involved in this long dittography. Clearly, however, the repetition itself is secondary.

---

<sup>42</sup>Rather than the translators themselves, probably, since analysis has shown LXX to exhibit a fairly literal translation technique. It is possible, of course, that εκ δευτερου—or το δευτερον, the reading of many mss (see above, pp. 44-45)—is an early inner-Greek addition, but the fact that all extant mss read one or the other of these readings suggests the presence of שנייה in the *Vorlage*.



(3:7) וּשְׂמוּאֵל מָרַם יָדָע אֶת יְהוָה וּמָרַם יָגֵלָה אֵלָיו דְּבַר יְהוָה

LXX \*אלהים ]יהוה

It is difficult to determine which of these words predates the other, and no compelling criteria exist for deciding the matter. On the one hand, the tendency of scribes would probably have been to change יהוה to אלהים, as the authors of Chronicles often did with material borrowed from Samuel (so, e.g., 1 Chr 14:13-17; 2 Sam 5:22-25). To argue that a scribe would also have changed other occurrences of יהוה to אלהים in the same chapter is invalid, since an examination shows that neither Chronicles nor the Elohist Psalter (Pss 42-83) replaces every single occurrence of יהוה with אלהים.<sup>43</sup> On the other hand, the word יהוה is present numerous times in the context, including once in the same verse, so a scribe might have inadvertently written יהוה instead of אלהים. LXX shows no particular tendency to replace יהוה with אלהים (or vice versa) in Samuel. However, a closer examination of some passages in Chronicles and in the Elohist Psalter reveals that scribes tended to replace groups of occurrences of יהוה rather than isolated cases, so the replacement of a lone case in the middle of a passage densely populated with instances of יהוה seems somewhat less likely than the accidental replacement of אלהים, so the reading of LXX is preferred by a small amount.

LXX \*ויגלה ]ומרם יגלה

M. O'Connor discusses the phenomenon of "prepositional override" in both his examination of Hebrew poetry and his grammar.<sup>44</sup> He cites a number of instances in the poetic sections of the Hebrew Bible where prepositional override occurs. The example he lists in his grammar, 1 Sam 15:22, is also a poetic fragment. The question that arises is whether or not the same phenomenon can occur in Hebrew prose. The reading of LXX would seem to suggest that the Hebrew *Vorlage* used by the Greek translators omitted the second מרם, though if this instance of prepositional override is unique in Hebrew prose, one would suspect some sort of error. The only example of the phenomenon in MT seems to be Ezek 39:4, and the editor of Ezekiel in BHS, K. Elliger, suggests that the preposition has dropped out and should be restored.<sup>45</sup> The possibility exists that Ezek 39:4 and

<sup>43</sup>Cf. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, s.v. "Names of God in the OT," by Martin Rose, 1006.

<sup>44</sup>O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 310-11; Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction*, 222-23. Mitchell Dahood describes the same phenomenon under the rubric "double-duty prepositions" in *Psalms III: 101-150*, The Anchor Bible, ed. William F. Albright and David Noel Freedman, vol. 17A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1970), 435-37. Cf. also Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §119hh.

<sup>45</sup>Hebrew mss and other versions in Ezek 39:4; 1 Sam 15:22; and other similar passages record variants that contain the missing preposition, but, though the reading of certain passages may be questionable, the phenomenon itself is well established in poetry. Elliger's suggestion in the case of Ezekiel is probably unfounded.

1 Sam 3:7 LXX preserve an archaic prose construction that has elsewhere been replaced by multiple prepositions, but without further documentation, the evidence is meagre. Another possibility, and one that deserves more consideration, is that both of these prose passages are either remnants of older poetic material or are themselves to be considered poetic in some sense. Walther Zimmerli, for example, considers this section of Ezekiel to be “rhythmically elevated prose.”<sup>46</sup> Is it possible that behind the story of Samuel’s call to prophecy preserved as a prose literary work lies an earlier poetic oral work? It is easy to see both parallelism and meter in 1 Sam 3:7, especially if the second **מֵרַם** is omitted as in LXX and the two-word phrase **דְּבַר יְהוָה** is taken as compensation for the missing preposition.<sup>47</sup> Finally, since a scribe would be much more apt to add the preposition than to delete it, the text of LXX should be preferred.

LXX<sup>L</sup> דְּבַר יְהוָה אֵלַי דְּבַר יְהוָה

The variant reading in LXX<sup>L</sup> involves the placement of the prepositional phrase **אֵלַי**. The most common word order for the second half of the verse would be passive verb, indirect object (prepositional phrase), direct object, as in MT, but the word order reflected in LXX<sup>L</sup> is also used in the OT. If one accepts the argument in the previous section that verse 7 might reflect the remnants of an earlier, poetic form of the story, the word order of MT would seem to preserve the parallelism better, since the direct objects of the verbs come at the ends of the two half-verses. If not, then the word order of MT can still be maintained as the most likely, the reading of LXX<sup>L</sup> being the result of an accidental alteration of the text.

(3:8) וַיִּסַּף יְהוָה קְרָא שְׁמוֹ אֵל בְּשִׁלְשִׁית וַיִּקָּם וַיֵּלֶךְ אֵלַי וַיֹּאמֶר הֲנָנִי כִי קְרָאתָ לִי וַיִּבֶן עָלַי כִּי יְהוָה קְרָא לְנֶעֱר

LXX<sup>O</sup> 70 עוֹד + ] 1° \*קְרָא

The presence or absence of **עוֹד** has been noted in other witnesses in other verses (see above, p. 248). Since the presence of the word here conforms verse 8 to verse 6, its

<sup>46</sup>Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, 2 vols., trans. James D. Martin, ed. Paul D. Hanson and Leonard J. Greenspoon (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979-83), 2:299. The whole passage runs as follows:

[The language of Ezek 38:1-9\*; 39:1-5, 17-20,] as has been observed again and again in Ezekiel, can be described neither as prose nor as tightly controlled speech. Rather, it reveals the character of a rhythmically elevated prose, in which there appear two-stress and three-stress lines which are occasionally connected in clear parallelism (see, e.g., 38:9; 39:17f) without being linked by fixed laws into a metrically self-contained whole.

<sup>47</sup>Cf. *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v., “Poetry, Hebrew,” by Norman K. Gottwald, 832.

originality is doubtful, especially since the following בשלשית makes it superfluous.

174 שמואל + [\*ויקם]

The extra שמואל further specifies the subject of the verb, though who the subject is is clear from the context. The interesting aspect of this reading is that it is found in the same Hebrew ms that omitted שמואל in a parallel context in verse 6. The shorter reading of MT should be preferred.

(3:9) ויאמר עלי לשמואל לך שכב והיה אם יקרא אליך ואמרת דבר יהוה כי שמע עבדך וילך שמואל וישכב במקומו

v ויאמר לשמואל | LXX\* ויאמר | 70 ויאמר עלי אל שמואל [ויאמר עלי לשמואל

MT (with a slight variant in ms 70) specifies both the subject and the object of the verb, whereas LXX specifies neither. One can readily see that scribes might want to identify the speaker and the addressee were they missing, since the last subject mentioned in the previous verse was Yahweh. No apparent reason for deleting the words exists, so it is probable that they represent scribal additions to the text. (V's *Vorlage* was probably identical to MT, but Jerome omitted "Eli" for stylistic reasons; see above, p. 185.)

LXX שוב [לך]

A discussion of these variants is reserved for later (see below, 270-72).

LXX בני + [\*שכב]

The presence or absence of a vocative בני in the witnesses is similar to the situation with עוד mentioned above: various witnesses include it in some place, while others exclude it, only to include it elsewhere (בני found in 3:5 P<sup>mss</sup>; 3:6 MT P T). The only verse in which בני is present in all the witnesses is verse 16. Since it is more likely that בני was added than that it dropped out, the reading of MT will be retained in the present verse.

P ואם [\*והיה אם]

The presence or absence of והיה makes no difference to the meaning of the verse, and one could argue that P's text is actually better Syriac than a strict rendering of MT would have been. Nevertheless, the translators tend to render almost every item in their Hebrew *Vorlage*, including a similar expression in 3:2. It is likely, then, that at some point והיה fell out of the stream of tradition that resulted in P, either as an attempt at stylistic

improvement or, more likely, by simple haplography. Thus, the text of MT is preferable.

כִּי ] אָס\* T<sup>ms</sup> 145 182

As mentioned above, the Masora preserves several apparent instances of the interchange of כִּי and אָס. It is possible that at least one ms of T reflects such a substitution here. The citation of the two Masoretic mss (neither of which is considered important by Goshen-Gottstein, hence the smaller type) does not suggest any sort of genetic connection with T. However, they illustrate the possibility of interchange between the two words. The evidence is admittedly slim, from the viewpoint of external evidence,<sup>48</sup> and since the two words have the same meaning in the context, the reading of MT will be retained.

תֹּאמֶר ] וְאָמַרְתָּ P

Most Hebrew conditional sentences have the apodosis begin with a *waw*, and it is likely that the alteration of the text, if it indeed occurred in Hebrew, was inadvertent, as explained in the previous chapter. Thus, the reading of MT should be preferred.

(3:10) וַיֵּבֵא יְהוָה וַיִּתְּצֵב וַיִּקְרָא כַּפֶּעַם בַּפֶּעַם שְׂמוּאֵל שְׂמוּאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר שְׂמוּאֵל דַּבֵּר  
כִּי שָׁמַע עֲבָדְךָ

LXX וַיִּקְרָא לוֹ ] \*וַיִּקְרָא

The reading לוֹ in LXX is a fairly obvious addition, specifying the object of the verb. It is therefore secondary and should be rejected.

LXX > ] שְׂמוּאֵל שְׂמוּאֵל

A discussion of these variants is reserved for later (see below, 270-72).

LXX<sup>O</sup> LXX<sup>mss</sup> P V<sup>mss</sup> arm ] \*דַּבֵּר + יְהוָה

This unit of variation could be seen as part of the larger set of variants which deal with repetition and variation among the witnesses, which will be considered below. The question that will be asked of those variants is whether they indicate different literary editions of 1 Samuel 3. Here, however, the distribution of the variants among the various witnesses indicates that the longer reading probably arose independently in many of the witnesses in an effort to conform Samuel's action in verse 10 with Eli's instruction in

<sup>48</sup>See above, pp. 241-43.

verse 9.<sup>49</sup> Thus, the reading of MT, LXX, and others should be retained.

(3:11) ויאמר יהוה אל שמואל הנה אנכי עשה דבר בישראל אשר כל שמעו  
תצלינה שתי אזניו

LXX דברי ]\*דבר

The addition of the pronominal suffix ך - does more than simply add specificity; it also changes the connotation of the word דבר from “thing” in MT (“I am doing something”) to “word” in LXX (“I am accomplishing my word”), a more prophetic idea. The context seems to support the claim of MT, since “my word” seems forced and stilted; furthermore, prophecy is not the focus of the passage. Thus, MT’s reading should be retained.

LXX T ]\*אשר

Many mss of both LXX and T support the reading of MT, but textual analysis of each of the versions suggests that the original texts of the translations omitted the subordinating conjunction. Waltke and O’Connor give several examples of asyndetic relative clauses, though they note that such clauses are more common in poetry.<sup>50</sup> No purely mechanical reason presents itself as a reason for the omission of אשר, but one can readily suppose that a scribe might have added the conjunction, either accidentally or with the motivation of improving the style, so that the phrase corresponded with more typical prose usage. In light of these considerations, the reading of LXX and T will be preferred to that of MT.

(3:12) ביום ההוא אקים אל עלי את כל אשר דברתי אל ביתו החל וכלה

LXX P T V ]\*על 1° אל

Many commentators have noted that each of the prepositions על and אל is often used in contexts in which one would normally expect the other.<sup>51</sup> This phenomenon could indicate either that the semantic fields of the two prepositions overlapped to some extent at

<sup>49</sup>Several mss of LXX apparently reversed this procedure, removing κριε in verse 9 in an attempt to make it conform to verse 10. Because one of the mss to do so is B, the base text in the Cambridge edition of LXX, scholars often cite the reading of B as though it were the reading of “the” LXX. Cf. the discussion of these LXX variants above, p. 47.

<sup>50</sup>Waltke and O’Connor, *Introduction*, 338. Cf. also Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §155f-m, where prose examples are given.

<sup>51</sup>E.g., S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, 12: “There is a tendency, however, in these two books to use על and אל interchangeably.”

the time of composition or during transmission, or that scribal errors have frequently crept into the text, perhaps because of aural confusion. One would primarily suspect semantic overlap in areas or times of Aramaic influence (i.e., either in northern Israel or during the Persian period or later).<sup>52</sup> BDB notes the interchange of **אל** and **על** in the books of Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, suggesting that the interchange in many cases is due to transcribers.<sup>53</sup> The seemingly better semantic fit of **על** during the preexilic period, combined with the possibility of scribal change during the period of transmission, suggests that this unit of variation may be related to the other textual problems associated with MT in Samuel. It seems preferable at this point, then, to adopt the text of LXX.

ויתו **אל**] בביתו\* LXX | ועל **על** LXX<sup>L</sup> (P T V omit conjunction)

The different prepositions in these three variants suggest that whichever one was original, it was accidentally replaced by one of the others, perhaps after having dropped out altogether. Any of the prepositions could have been omitted by simple haplography, but the chances are slightly better that one of the two *beths* in the second variant might have been accidentally omitted when *beth* was written only once. Assuming that the original preposition dropped out, which preposition would a scribe have inserted in its place? Based on the context, either **על** or **אל** seems a likely candidate. Thus, **ב** is less likely to be a secondary insertion. Based on this evidence, then, **בביתו** seems to be the most probable reading.<sup>54</sup>

(3:13) והגדתי לו כי שפט אני את ביתו עד עולם בעון אשר ידע כי מקללים  
להם בניו ולא כהה במ

והגדת] וואגד\* LXX T V | והגדת] cj S. R. Driver

Though some commentators have argued that the construction in MT is a *waw* conjunctive with the perfect, referring to the past,<sup>55</sup> it seems better to take it as a *waw* consecutive construction, referring to the future. The translators of P certainly understood their *Vorlage*, presumably the same as MT here, to refer to the future (or perhaps the present). The other secondary witnesses, however, all read the *waw* consecutive imperfect form, referring to past time. In fact, the variant in V is the only significant variant that

<sup>52</sup>BDB notes the use of **על** with the force of a dative by writers of the “silver age,” i.e., the postexilic period; BDB, s.v. “על.”

<sup>53</sup>BDB, s.v. “אל,” note 2.

<sup>54</sup>The conjunction in the third variant restructures the sentence, so that **ועל ביתו** belongs with the passage that follows, rather than that which precedes.

<sup>55</sup>Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher*, 29.

remains after all the other potential variants have been eliminated. If the reference is to past time, the most obvious point of reference would be 1 Sam 2:27-36, a passage that speaks of a prophet (literally, a man of God) delivering a message of judgment to Eli. Since verse 12 refers to a prior message of judgment of which Eli is apparently already aware, one would also expect the present verse to do the same. If the reading of MT were accepted, then the message given to Samuel would be new and unknown, but such is not the case. Of course, one could argue that the reading reflects an earlier stratum in the literary process, particularly since many scholars take 2:27-36 to be a late addition to the book. However, though an editor might not strive to make a verse inserted at one point match another some distance away, he would be more likely to work to make consecutive verses correspond. Thus, the reading of LXX, T, and V seems preferable to that of MT at this point.

cj BHK REB NJB | אשר ידע \* יען אשר ידע | LXX בעונת בנו ] בעון אשר ידע  
Wellhausen

Although with some imagination it is possible to look at the two extant variants and find some similarly shaped letters in the Old Hebrew alphabet, it is doubtful if one variant arose from the other because of graphic confusion. It is possible that this unit of variation should be considered below along with several others as a possible instance of differences on a literary level. However, the differences here do not relate to repetition of similar elements in parallel constructions (or the lack thereof), as most of the others do. The variants seem unrelated to both the preceding unit of variation and to the next one, the *tiqqun sopherim*, which is also reflected in LXX. The two readings are not substitutional variants, for, though they correspond in position, they are not semantically equivalent. In fact, one could easily envision a conflate reading arising that read **בעון בנו אשר ידע**. Another possibility is that both variants are later, independent additions to a text that originally read simply **בעון**. The problem with the text of MT as it stands is that, while not ungrammatical, it is certainly awkward, and the phrase **בעון אשר ידע** is unusual in that it follows the expression **עד עולם**, an expression that usually ends a phrase.<sup>56</sup> By rearranging the accents of MT, one could translate “I am judging his house forever because of sin, which he knew about, because his sons . . .” However, this rendering is still somewhat cumbersome. LXX avoids the awkwardness of MT, but its reading is redundant, mentioning Eli’s sons twice in a span of only a few words. BHK suggests replacing **בעון** with **יען**, a suggestion followed by the translators of the *Revised English Bible* (REB) and the *New Jerusalem Bible* (NJB). Wellhausen suggests omitting **בעון** and taking **אשר** as a conjunction, thus joining the phrase **אשר ידע** with the following

<sup>56</sup>MT does have an *athnah* under **עולם**, but it joins **בעון** with **אשר ידע**, indicating the close connection of this phrase with what precedes.

clause.<sup>57</sup> A corruption in the text is apparent, and it seems to have infected both MT and LXX. Although Wellhausen's solution cannot be ruled out, the graphic similarity between ען and בעון, combined with the fact that אשר often follows ען to form a kind of compound conjunction, suggest that the emendation of BHK may be preferable.<sup>58</sup>

להם]אלהים\* *tiq soph* LXX

The *tiqqune sopherim*, or scribal corrections, were primarily designed to preserve the dignity of God, especially by avoiding certain combinations of words that could be taken as disrespectful or blasphemous. Masoretic tradition records that להם in this verse was originally אלהים, a reading both graphically similar and better suited to the context. Of the ancient versions, only LXX preserves the pre-corrected reading, but that reading is undoubtedly the one to be preferred.

(3:14) ולכן נשבעתי לבית עלי אם יתכפר עון בית עלי בזבח ובמנחה עד עולם

ולכן]ולכן P v LXX ולא כן]\*ולכן

LXX has a different word division and an extra א. The effect of this difference is to throw the phrase ולא כן back to the previous verse, which in LXX ends, “and he did not rebuke them; and not only thus (or, and that is not all).” לא and לו are occasionally confused (e.g., 1 Sam 2:16; 20:2), and the present confusion probably also arose out of graphic or, more likely, aural confusion.<sup>59</sup> Of these two variants, the reading of MT flows more smoothly and corresponds more closely to typical Hebrew idiom, so ולכן should be preferred to לא כן. As for the conjunction, which P lacks, the addition and omission of conjunctions is not uncommon in the mss of any of the witnesses, but the presence of the conjunction in both MT and LXX strengthens the case for the presence of the conjunction in the text that lay behind both of them, especially since they differ in other respects. Thus, the reading of MT should be preferred over that of LXX or P.

לבית]\* > 89

The failure of ms 89 to include לבית is probably the result of haplography caused by the similar ending on the preceding word (נשבעתי). Since the resulting sentence is grammatically anomalous, because of the loss of the *nomen regens*, the reading of the base

<sup>57</sup> Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 53.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. BDB, s.v., “יען.”

<sup>59</sup> Though most cognate languages also contain a negative in the form *l'*, the corresponding negative in Ugaritic is spelled with a simple *l*; see Cyrus H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, Analecta Orientalia, no. 38 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965), 425 (Glossary, s.v. “*l* II”).



text should be retained.

(3:15) וישכב שמואל עד הבקר ויפתח את דלתות בית יהוה ושמואל ירא מהגיד  
את המראה אל עלי

] > 70 [\*הבקר

The omission of הבקר after the preposition עד leaves an obviously ungrammatical sentence, so the text of the majority of Masoretic mss should be preferred.

LXX \*וישכם בבקר + ]הבקר

According to MT, Samuel was sleeping one moment and opening the doors of the temple the next. Though not impossible, this sequence seems to lack a transitional element. That missing element is present in LXX, which includes the phrase וישכם בבקר after וישכב שמואל עד הבקר. This phrase was probably omitted inadvertently as a result of parablepsis, specifically homoioteleuton, when the scribes eye skipped from הבקר to בבקר. It is possible that homoiarkton also played a role, since וישכם is similar to וישכם. Therefore, the reading of LXX has a greater likelihood of being the older text.

P דלת [\*דלתות

The difference between MT and P is probably the result of graphic confusion between the singular and the plural in Hebrew. If the Hebrew text at some stage used defective spelling more widely than MT does, the plural of the word in question would have been דלתות, and the only difference between this word and the singular form is the added ת at the end of the word. An extra ת could have arisen as a result of dittography; on the other hand, a ת could have disappeared as a result of haplography. It is possible that a scribe might have seen the plural as an anachronism associated with Solomon's temple, as opposed to the single curtain of the sanctuary, but if so, he ignored the far greater problem of Samuel's presence in the sanctuary near the ark. Though absolute certainty is impossible, it seems best to retain the plural reading of MT.

LXX<sup>O</sup> אל הים [\*יהוה

The phrase בית יהוה is used consistently throughout Samuel and Kings, whether in reference to the sanctuary at Shiloh or to Solomon's temple. However, though בית יהוה continues to predominate, בית (ה) אל הים occurs with some frequency in 2 Chronicles.<sup>60</sup> This shift in the direction of substituting אל הים for יהוה later in Israel's

<sup>60</sup>See 2 Chr 3:3; 5:14; 7:5; 15:18; 22:12; 23:9; 24:7, 13, 27; 25:24; 28:24 *bis*; 31:13, 21; 33:7;

history has already been touched upon above (p. 251). It is probable that **אל הים** crept into the text here as a result of this postexilic tendency, so the reading of MT should be retained as the earlier one.

וירא מהגיד את המראה אל עלי ]ושמואל ירא מהגיד את המראה אל עלי  
LXX<sup>O</sup>\* וירא מהגיד את המראה אל עלי | LXX<sup>L</sup> שמואל

These variants deal with the presence and placement of the subject of the main verb, **שמואל**. MT places the subject at the beginning of the clause, a perfectly acceptable position, although one might have expected a position immediately following the verb **ירא**. LXX<sup>L</sup> puts the subject at the end of the clause, a position that is good Greek style but that stretches the limits of normal Hebrew style. LXX<sup>O</sup> omits the word altogether. Which of these, if any, predates the others? If one follows the rule that MT should be followed whenever no problem is evident, then MT should be followed. However, that approach has been considered and rejected. If one considers only the main reading of LXX, or perhaps occasionally one of the other secondary witnesses, the readings of LXX<sup>L</sup> and LXX<sup>O</sup> will also both be immediately rejected, since they represent revisions of LXX and thus, it could be argued, tertiary witnesses. But this approach has also been dismissed in favor of an approach that considers the historical development of each of the witnesses. In those places in which the Lucianic and hexaplaric recensions differ from both MT and LXX, they often apparently deviate in the direction of Hebrew texts that were extant at the time. The varied positions, or absence, of **שמואל** in these witnesses indicates the probability that the word is a later addition to the text-tradition, perhaps inserted marginally at first (whence LXX<sup>L</sup>'s anomalous placement), then given a permanent place in the tradition at the beginning of the clause. If **שמואל** was not originally part of the text, it is possible that a scribe might have wanted to insert it so that the last noun in the previous phrase, **יהוה**, was not taken as the subject of the present clause, especially since the verb was **ירא**, a verb not suitable for God. The reading of LXX<sup>O</sup>, then, will be accepted.

אל 89 | > 187 ] 2° \* את

The sign of the definite direct object is what one would expect in the present context, appearing as it does before **המראה**, unless good reason exists for its absence. No such reason appears forthcoming in this verse. Ms 187 omits it altogether, probably by simple haplography. Ms 89 has the preposition **אל** instead, but this reading is surely an error, perhaps based both on graphic similarity with **את** and on the occurrence of **אל** just two words later. The reading of the majority of mss will be retained here.

---

34:9; 35:8; 36:18, 19. In most cases, the form used is **בית האל הים**, with the article.

(3:16) ויקרא עלי את שמואל ויאמר שמואל בני ויאמר הנני

ויאמר | T 89 174 \*ויקרא עלי אל שמואל ויאמר [ויקרא עלי את שמואל ויאמר  
LXX עלי אל שמואל

All of the variants in verse 16 revolve around the introductory clause. Mss 89, 174, and T (cf. LXX) all read the preposition **אל** instead of **את** after **ויקרא**. A survey of the verb **קרא** in Samuel and Kings reveals that when the object of the verb is a person (as opposed to phrases such as . . . **ויקרא שמו** or **ויקרא דברים**), the prepositions **אל** and **ל** are used almost exclusively at the expense of **את**, though the latter does appear on rare occasion. Moreover, every other occurrence of the verb in the present chapter is followed by one of the two former prepositions. It is likely, then, that **אל** is to be preferred to **את**. The question of the omission of **ויקרא** and the transposition of **ויאמר** in LXX is somewhat more difficult. On the one hand, the double verb in MT is consistent with Hebrew style. On the other hand, the reason for the omission of **ויקרא** and the transposition of **ויאמר** is not immediately evident. One possibility is that **ויקרא** was omitted by simple haplography, leaving an awkward sentence, which a later scribe corrected by moving **ויאמר**. A similar scenario is that a scribe's eye skipped from **עלי** in the preceding verse to **עלי** in this verse, omitting **ויקרא עלי**. When the resulting sentence was found to be nonsense, the verb **ויאמר** was moved to the beginning of the sentence and the subject **עלי** was reintroduced. It is always possible that **ויקרא** and **ויאמר** are substitutional variants, only one of which was in the earliest form of the text, but the argument based on Hebrew idiom seems stronger. Thus, the reading of 89 174 T, which differs only slightly from MT, is to be preferred.

(3:17) ויאמר מה הדבר אשר דבר אל יד אל נא תכחד ממני כה יעשה לך אל הים  
וכה יוסיף אם תכחד ממני דבר מכל הדבר אשר דבר אליך

70 > ]\*אשר דבר

The omission of the phrase in ms 70 is the result of parablepsis, as the scribe's eye skipped from **הדבר** to **דבר**, omitting the words in between. The reading of the base text is preferable.

P אל נא תפחד | 187 אל תכחד נא ]\*אל נא תכחד

The delayed occurrence of the particle **נא** in ms 187 is abnormal and almost certainly secondary, since **אל נא** is what one would expect. The reading of P is more interesting. Instead of warning Samuel not to hide anything from him, in P Eli comforts him by telling him not to be afraid of him. Graphic similarity was clearly a factor in the

confusion of תפחד and תכחד, but which reading is the basis for the other? If Eli had wanted to tell Samuel not to be afraid, the more common way would have been to say, אל תיראי. In addition, Eli's words of comfort in P are quickly contradicted by his threat of divine judgment if Samuel does not tell him the contents of the vision. Furthermore, תכחד ממני at the end of the verse parallels this portion of the verse, implying that תכחד stood here. Thus, the reading of MT is to be preferred.

[\*כה יעשה לך אלהים וכה יוסיף אם תכחד ממני] > 70

The shorter text in ms 70 is the result of parablepsis from ממני 1° to ממני 2°. The resulting reading could easily have gone unnoticed, since it makes good sense as it stands. Nevertheless, it is the reading of the majority of Masoretic mss that is preferable.

הדברים [\*הדבר] 187 LXX P V

The reading of ms 187—which is supported by LXX, P, and V—has a plural rather than a singular noun, since God spoke several words to Samuel. The singular in the majority of Hebrew mss should be taken as a collective noun and translated “the message” rather than “the word.” The scribe of ms 187 (or his predecessor) altered the singular to the plural, perhaps inadvertently, in order to ensure that the reader did not think that God had spoken only a single word to Samuel. The plurals in the versions arose out of the need the translators felt to create idiomatic readings, and so they were not considered significant. The reading of MT should be retained.

LXX \*באונך [אל יך]

אל יך and באונך are substitutional variants, since they play corresponding roles in their respective sentences. No apparent graphic similarity exists between the two variants, so some other reason for textual alteration must be sought. The phrase באונך is somewhat cumbersome, but thoroughly Hebraic (cf. 1 Sam 15:14; 25:24; 2 Sam 7:22; 18:12; 22:7, etc.). It is more likely that a scribe would have substituted the colorless, though more literal, phrase אל יך for באונך than vice versa.<sup>61</sup> It is also possible that אל יך arose as a gloss on באונך, later to be inserted into the text itself. The reading of LXX probably reflects the earlier reading.

<sup>61</sup>Cf. 1 Sam 1:23, where LXX also has the “more Hebraic” text, and Walters’s discussion of this passage; S. D. Walters, “Hannah and Anna,” 400.

(3:18) ויגד לו שמואל את כל הדברים ולא כחד ממנו ויאמר יהוה הוא הטוב  
בעינו יעשה

ל] >\* LXX

The excess text in MT could be an explanatory expansion, or the absence of the word in LXX could be the result of haplography. נגד does usually occur with an indirect object introduced by ל (or occasionally אל), but it also sometimes occurs without any indication of the object. It seems more likely that a scribe would have added לו in keeping with the prevailing custom than that one would have omitted it for some reason. Thus, the reading of LXX should be preferred.

174 האלה + ]\*הדברים

The demonstrative in ms 174 qualifies the noun הדברים and is almost certainly secondary. A scribe, perhaps subconsciously, apparently considered the sentence as it stood to be in need of clarification. The reading of MT should be retained.

LXX P עלי + ]\*ויאמר

Earlier in this verse it was MT that had an explanatory addition; here it is LXX. עלי specifies the subject of the verb ויאמר, which might have been considered ambiguous since שמואל was the last subject mentioned. Furthermore, since יהוה immediately follows the verb, a scribe might have wanted to avoid the implication that it was God who was speaking. As is often the case with explanatory additions, this one appears to be secondary, and the text of MT should be followed.

174 > ]\*הוא

The omission of the pronoun הוא after יהוה is probably the result of haplography caused by the graphic similarity of the two words. The fact that the next word הטוב also begins with ה may have been a contributing factor as well. In any case, the reading of MT is to be preferred.

(3:19) ויגדל שמואל ויהוה היה עמו ולא הפיל מכל דבריו ארצה

LXX \*ויהי יהוה [ויהוה היה

When Hebrew writers wanted to state the fact or express the wish that God would be with someone, they would usually do so without recourse to a form of יהוה; for example, ויהוה עמו (1 Sam 16:18; 18:14), ויהוה עמם (Jdg 1:22), and so forth.

When they did choose to use a form of הִיָּה, they almost invariably placed it before the subject: כִּי הִיָּה יְהוָה עִמּוֹ (1 Sam 18:12); וְהִיָּה יְהוָה עִמּוֹ (2 Kgs 18:7); יְהִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ עִמָּנוּ (1 Kgs 8:57); כִּי הִיָּה יְהוָה עִמָּךְ (Gen 26:3). The only exceptions to this latter rule are the present passage, 1 Sam 17:37, and 2 Sam 14:17. However, the LXX readings in both 1 Samuel passages put the verb first, and the context shows a great likelihood of graphic confusion. Only in 2 Sam 14:17 is the subject before the verb in both MT and LXX (and here LXX is *kaige*, not OG; the word order in LXX<sup>L</sup> is slightly different). What this evidence means for the current unit of variation is that, barring some compelling reason for putting the subject first, the verb should probably come first, followed by the subject. Thus, the reading of LXX will be accepted here.

לֹא לֹא LXX<sup>L</sup> ]\*ולֹא

The lack of a conjunction in LXX<sup>L</sup> could be the result of haplography triggered by the preceding ׀ on the end of עִמּוֹ. On the other hand, the extra conjunction in MT could be the result of dittography. The lack of a conjunction between clauses is unusual in Hebrew, and it serves to stress the following clause (cf. 3:2). However, verse 19 appears to have an intentional three-fold structure, which would be disturbed by the omission of the conjunction. In light of this observation, the reading of MT will be retained.

(3:20) וַיֵּדַע כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל מִדֶּן וְעַד בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע כִּי נֶאֱמַן שְׁמוּאֵל לְנָבִיא לַיהוָה

P לֹא לֹא הִיָּה | 174 בֵּית יְהוָה ]\*לִיהוָה

The reading in ms 174, בֵּית יְהוָה, probably derived from the reading preserved in MT by means of dittography and graphic confusion: לְנָבִיא בֵּית became לְנָבִיא, and the ל before יְהוָה was dropped. The reading of the majority of Masoretic mss is preferable to that of ms 174. The reading preserved in P substitutes לֹא הִיָּה for MT's יְהוָה. The phrase לְנָבִיא לִיהוָה occurs in several other passages in the OT, while לְנָבִיא לֹא הִיָּה is apparently not represented in MT. However, the relative scarcity of even the phrase לְנָבִיא לִיהוָה (between ten and twenty occurrences) urges caution. Perhaps the change from יְהוָה to לֹא הִיָּה can be explained as another example of the tendency of later scribes to change לֹא הִיָּה to יְהוָה. In any case, the reading of MT should be preserved.

(3:21) וַיִּסַּף יְהוָה לְהִרְאֹה בְּשֵׁלָה כִּי נִגְלָה יְהוָה אֶל שְׁמוּאֵל בְּשֵׁלּוֹ בְּדַבַּר יְהוָה

70 אֶל מְנוּחָה + ]\*לְהִרְאֹה

One of the most interesting readings in the Masoretic mss in 1 Samuel 3 is this apparent gloss in ms 70. Since the verse notes that the Lord continued to appear, a scribe

probably confirmed this statement by writing in the margin “to Manoah,” a reference to Judges 13. Somehow the marginal note found its way into the text. Though clearly not original, it is a good demonstration of the phenomenon of glossing.

187 > [\*נגלה יהוה אל שמואל בשלו]

Ms 187’s failure to render this phrase is probably the result of parablepsis, the scribe’s eye skipping from **בשלה** to **בשלו**. The **כי** following **בשלה** and preceding the phrase under consideration somehow survived the parablepsis, or perhaps it was restored at some point in the process of transmission. The reading of MT is preferable.

89 > [\*בשלו]

The omission of **בשלו** by ms 89 could be the result of parablepsis (homoioarkton) with the following word **בדבר**, or it might have dropped out accidentally for some other reason. The text of the majority of Masoretic mss should be retained.

89 כדבר כדבר [\*בדבר]

The reason for the duplication in ms 89 must be simple dittography, but the reason for the change in prepositions is less obvious. Graphic similarity may have played a role in the change, but it is just as likely that a scribe felt that **כ** was a better fit for the context than **ב**. In any case, the reading of ms 89 is inferior.

P בדבריו [\*בדבר יהוה]

The reading of P is probably derived from a Hebrew ms in which the divine name was abbreviated **י** (or something similar). The abbreviation was mistakenly read as a pronominal suffix, changing the noun from singular to plural in the process. The reading of P makes even less sense than the reading of MT, so MT’s rendering should be preferred.

LXX | בשלו כדבר יהוה > mss T<sup>edd</sup>v

This unit of variation is discussed with the following one.

וַיֵּאמֶן שְׁמוּאֵל נְבִיא לַיהוָה אֵל כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ וְעַד + [3° יְהוָה  
וַיֵּאמֶן לַיהוָה | LXX קִצָּה וְעַלִּי זֶקֶן מְאֹד וּבְנֵי הַלֹּךְ הִלְכוּ וְרַע דְּרַכְּכֵם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה  
לְנְבִיא יְהוָה אֵל כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ וְעַד קִצָּה וְעַלִּי זֶקֶן מְאֹד וּבְנֵי הַלֹּךְ  
וַיֵּאמֶן שְׁמוּאֵל נְבִיא לַיהוָה אֵל | LXX<sup>L</sup> הִלְכוּ וְרַע דְּרַכְּכֵם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה  
כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ עַד קִצָּה וְעַלִּי זֶקֶן מְאֹד וּבְנֵי הַלֹּךְ הִלְכוּ וְרַע דְּרַכְּכֵם  
LXX<sup>O</sup> לִפְנֵי יְהוָה

It is clear that a substantial disturbance has occurred in the witnesses in verse 21. The variants can be broken into two units, the first of which involves the omission in LXX of several words that are found in MT, and the second of which concerns the addition of many words in LXX. Also related to these variants are the differences between MT and LXX in 4:1a. These units of variation are clearly the most significant in the whole chapter in terms of the number of words involved, and the reason for this great difference must be considered. Scholarly opinion is divided over whether these differences are purely textual or whether they should be considered differences on the literary level. The former position is held by such people as Thenius, McCarter, and Klein.<sup>62</sup> They attribute the differences in the witnesses largely to mechanical errors and later attempts to remedy those errors. Others, such as de Boer and the Committee for the Textual Analysis of the Hebrew Old Testament, take the latter position.<sup>63</sup> They believe the additions in LXX to be drawn from other passages and to reflect a stage of the text prior to the settling of its final form.

Thenius, Klein, and McCarter all assert that the shorter text of MT is the result of parablepsis, though the circumstances they envision are slightly different. All three would delete וַיֵּאמֶן שְׁמוּאֵל נְבִיא לַיהוָה אֵל כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ וְעַד קִצָּה as a variant of 3:20. Thenius would then add the first five words of 4:1 MT (missing in LXX), וַיְהִי דְבַר שְׁמוּאֵל לְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל, followed by the rest of the long addition in LXX. He believes that a scribe's eye skipped from לְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל (4:1 MT) to עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל (4:1 LXX), resulting in the reading of MT. He posits a second parablepsis for another scribe, this time from אֵל שְׁמוּאֵל (3:21) to לְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל (4:1 MT), resulting in the reading of LXX.<sup>64</sup> Klein believes that the words בְּשֵׁלוֹ בְּדַבַּר יְהוָה וַיְהִי דְבַר שְׁמוּאֵל in 3:21 and 4:1 MT are secondary, added to make sense of the text only after the loss of the original words. A scribe in the tradition of MT skipped from שְׁמוּאֵל (3:21 MT) to עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל (4:1 LXX).<sup>65</sup> McCarter agrees with Klein in omitting בְּשֵׁלוֹ from 3:21 MT, but he keeps וַיְהִי דְבַר שְׁמוּאֵל לְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל in 4:1. The

<sup>62</sup>Thenius, *Bücher Samuels*, 17; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 97, 103; R. W. Klein, *I Samuel*, 30.

<sup>63</sup>De Boer, *I Samuel i-xvi*, 56; Barthélemy, ed., *Critique textuelle*, 1:152.

<sup>64</sup>Thenius, *Bücher Samuels*, 17.

<sup>65</sup>R. W. Klein, *I Samuel*, 30.



rest of his proposal is the same as that of Thenius.<sup>66</sup>

De Boer and the members of the Committee believe that the differences between the two witnesses are literary rather than textual. De Boer says, “III 21b and IV 1a introduce the coming incidents and strengthen the bond between the youth history of Samuel and the stories to come.”<sup>67</sup> Barthélemy and the other members of the Committee state that none of the three additional clauses in Gk shows originality, but all are based on other passages (3:20; 4:15; 4:1ff.). They say, “the fact that MT does not offer any joint between the two narratives that critics could recognize as literarily heterogeneous is a remarkable indication of its great antiquity.”<sup>68</sup>

Which of these two disparate positions is more probable? If it were demonstrated that 1 Samuel LXX offers a text that differs from that of MT on a literary level (see below, pp. 268-70), the case for a literary origin would be strengthened. Even so, however, the likelihood of mechanical error (parablepsis) tips the evidence in favor of a textual solution for 3:21 and 4:1a. The additional material in LXX does not seem to reflect any trend that has been noted elsewhere in LXX.<sup>69</sup> In particular, the excess material present in the story of David and Goliath is preserved in MT, not LXX. The Committee’s observation that the additional Greek clauses show no innovation is valid enough, but that fact in itself is insufficient reason for denying their place in the text, since threads of connection run back and forth in the narrative in both MT and LXX and, for that matter, in all narrative. In fact, one could argue just the opposite, that similar style and vocabulary supports the originality of the LXX additions (with the exception, of course, of the material repeated from verse 20).

If the differences between LXX and MT in verse 21 are textual rather than literary, one must decide which version contains a witness to the earlier form of the text or whether neither completely preserves it. It is immediately obvious that the phrase **בְּשֵׁלֹו בְּדַבֵּר יְהוָה** is problematic. The different spelling of “Shiloh” in the same verse is unusual, though not unprecedented, and both **שֵׁלֹו** and **שֵׁלֹה** appear frequently enough in Samuel. Moreover, the repetition of “Shiloh,” though perhaps redundant to modern ears, seems to accord well enough with Hebrew idiom, so this word, at least, should probably be retained. More difficult is the phrase **בְּדַבֵּר יְהוָה**, whose exact meaning is unclear. Some witnesses read **בְּדַבֵּר יְהוָה**, but this reading cannot be considered a significant variant in any of the witnesses; furthermore, it helps very little, since the phrase remains awkward

<sup>66</sup>McCarter, *I Samuel*, 97, 103.

<sup>67</sup>De Boer, *I Samuel i-xvi*, 56.

<sup>68</sup>Barthélemy, ed., *Critique textuelle*, 1:152.

<sup>69</sup>*Contra* De Boer, *I Samuel i-xvi*, 56. It must be remembered that the translation technique of LXX has been found to be a literal one, and any differences from MT on a literary level would have arisen in the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

and unnecessary. It is possible that the circumstances that disrupted the text have left a fragment of a lost sentence that would have made sense, but it seems best in light of the extant evidence to dismiss this phrase as secondary, though its origin remains obscure.

Although Klein omits the first five words of 4:1, they seem natural enough in the context, and provide a fitting conclusion to the story in chapter 3: Samuel has moved from boy ministering to Eli in the sanctuary to man bring the word of the Lord to all Israel. That this phrase is more fitting as a conclusion to chapter 3 than as an introduction to chapter 4 is made clearer when the long addition in LXX is analyzed.

In MT, chapter 4 begins with the note that Israel went out to fight the Philistines. The story as it concerns Eli comes to its primary conclusion in 4:18 with the death of Eli and the statement that he had judged Israel for forty years. Verses 19-22 form a sort of appendix to the story, tying it in with the further adventures of the ark in the following chapters. Commentators see the notice in verse 18 that Eli had judged Israel for forty years (LXX: twenty years) as a Deuteronomistic attempt to fit Eli into the pattern of the judges in the book of Judges.<sup>70</sup> This conclusion to the story accords well with the introduction to this pericope in LXX, detailing once again his age (cf. 4:15) and his sons' sin (cf. 4:11, 17). Furthermore, LXX's introduction to the circumstances of the battle ("And it came about in those days that the Philistines assembled themselves to fight against Israel") meshes well with the following notice ("and Israel went out to fight against them"), in contrast to the abrupt start of the narrative in MT ("and Israel went out to fight against the Philistines"). Thus, it is likely that the long addition in LXX, with the exception of the repetition of the material from verse 20, represents the older text.<sup>71</sup>

#### Variants That Pertain to the Question of Multiple Literary Editions

The time has arrived to discuss the variants that bear upon the question of different literary versions in 1 Samuel 3. It has already been concluded that the variants in verse 21 are of a textual rather than literary nature, but this decision does not prejudice the case against the variants to be considered here. Differences in the story of David and Goliath that probably depend on editorial activity have already been noted. Walters has argued that 1 Samuel 1 also contains evidence of different literary editions in MT and LXX, though not all concur. Cook has decided against a literary solution to the differences between MT and LXX over the differences in 2:11 and the placement of the Song of

<sup>70</sup>Cf. H. P. Smith, *Books of Samuel*, 36; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 114-15.

<sup>71</sup>A comment on the material that parallels verse 20 is in order at this point. It is likely that these words are a textual alternative to verse 20 that was misplaced at some point in the tradition. Which of the versions is earlier? The key to deciding lies in the phrases *מִדָּן וְעַד בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע* in MT and *מִקְצֵה הַיַּרְדֵּן וְעַד קִצְיָה* in LXX. Both phrases occur in MT, but only the former appears in Samuel and Kings (2 Sam 3:10; 17:11; 24:2, 15; 1 Kgs 5:5), while the latter is limited to Deuteronomy and Jeremiah (Deut 13:8; 28:64; Jer 12:12; 25:33). On this basis, it is probable that the version found in MT is preferable to that in LXX, LXX<sup>L</sup>, and LXX<sup>O</sup>.

Hannah in 1 Samuel 2.<sup>72</sup>

Before examining the variants in chapter 3, a couple of methodological questions must be answered. First, what are the criteria for identifying a different edition of the text? Is a large number of variants sufficient grounds for concluding that different editions exist, or must identifiable patterns of variation exist? In the first place, a distinction must be made between significant and nonsignificant variants. If all apparent variants are considered, V has more deviations from MT in 1 Samuel 3 than any of the other secondary witnesses. However, when nonsignificant variants are eliminated, V contains only one significant variant (3:13), and that supported by LXX and T. Even when only significant variants are considered, the answer to the question is still not obvious. To try to reach a conclusion by comparing two witnesses to a text, one of which had many deviations from the arbitrarily chosen base text and the other of which did not, would be begging the question. Instead, two analogies may be considered. The first one concerns the development of two daughter languages from a single parent language, such as Spanish and Portuguese from Latin. As the development of the two languages is traced historically, their divergence grows as the temporal distance from the parent language increases. Thus, a large number of variants in a particular witness from a base text may indicate the passage of a great deal of time in separate text-traditions rather than the existence of separate editions. The second analogy involves a comparison of texts which have a common origin but are admittedly different literary editions. If the parallel passages of Kings and Chronicles are compared, one immediately notes a number of differences in the texts, most of which are due to the authors of Chronicles, who had particular historical interests, theological stances, and pastoral concerns (to use an anachronism), all of which are reflected to a large extent in the differences between the texts. Therefore, *one should only claim to find a different literary edition when certain patterns of variation exist in a witness.*<sup>73</sup>

The second methodological question is this: if different editions do exist, is one to be preferred as the older set of readings (and how can the older edition be identified?), or should each reading or group of readings be examined independently?<sup>74</sup> The answer to this question may seem paradoxical, but it is nevertheless the correct one. One edition may be preferred as containing the older readings, but each reading or group of readings should

---

<sup>72</sup>See above, pp. 237-40.

<sup>73</sup>Cf. Tov's comment in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 314: "It is assumed that large-scale differences displaying a certain coherence were created at the level of the literary growth of the books by persons who considered themselves actively involved in the literary process of composition."

<sup>74</sup>It should be remembered that the target selected for this text-critical investigation was the oldest possible text. Given a demonstrated multiple literary edition, other textual critics might prefer the edition that contains the latest set of variants, arguing that the latest form represents the completion of the canonical process as accepted by one or more faith communities. Thus, Ulrich says, "The texts were authoritative texts, and through the traditioning process they were being made more authoritative"; Ulrich, "Canonical Process and Textual Criticism," 289.

still be examined independently. The reason for examining readings in the later edition is that it may on occasion preserve older readings that have disappeared from the older edition. Thus, the Lucianic edition of LXX, though overall later than OG, sometimes preserves older readings, derived either from the Hebrew mss toward which it was corrected or preserved directly from OG when all typical OG witnesses are corrupt. It is also possible for late readings to creep into a generally older text, so evaluating each set of variants is imperative. Once a pattern of revision and a relative chronological order has been established, the older edition should be preferred whenever revision is apparent. The older edition should also be preferred when literary causes for variation are suspected but neither reading is demonstrably older.

Having determined guidelines for detecting the existence of multiple literary editions and choosing readings among them, it is time to turn to the set of readings in 1 Samuel 3 that concern Yahweh's repeated call of Samuel. The readings are as follows.

(3:4) LXX שמואל שמואל | 4QSam<sup>a</sup> שמןואל שמואל? ] אל שמואל

(3:5) LXX וישב ] וילך

(3:6) LXX שמואל + ] 1° שמואל

(3:9) LXX שוב ] לך

(3:10) LXX > ] שמואל שמואל

A comparison of these variants may perhaps be appreciated better by graphic means. They may be divided into two groups: those that deal with the number of times God calls Samuel and those that treat Eli's command and Samuel's response. Call 1 is found in 3:4-5, call 2 in 3:6-7, call 3 in 3:8-9, call 4 in 3:10 (in part). The last call, of course, differs from the others in that God continues speaking to Samuel, so only the first chart, dealing with God's call of Samuel, contains data from all four calls. The textual decisions decided upon above are integrated into the texts of MT and LXX (which is presented in retroverted form) in order to highlight the possible literary differences.<sup>75</sup>

## CHART 1

### God's Call of Samuel

	MT (corrected)	LXX (retroverted and corrected)
Call 1	ויקרא יהוה אל שמואל	ויקרא יהוה שמואל שמואל
Call 2	ויספ יהוה ויקרא שמואל	ויספ יהוה ויקרא שמואל שמואל
Call 3	ויספ יהוה קרא שמואל בשלשית	ויספ יהוה קרא שמואל בשלשית
Call 4	ויבא יהוה ויתיצב ויקרא בפעם בפעם שמואל שמואל	ויבא יהוה ויתיצב ויקרא בפעם בפעם

<sup>75</sup>For a discussion of these variants as a group from the standpoint of whether or not they are significant on the basis of literary analysis, see above, p. 174.

**CHART 2**Eli's Command and Samuel's Response

	MT (corrected)	LXX (retroverted and corrected)
Call 1	שוב שכב וילך וישכב	שוב שכב וישב וישכב
Call 2	שוב שכב	שוב שכב
Call 3	לך שכב . . . וילך שמואל וישכב במקומו	שוב שכב בני . . . וילך שמואל וישכב במקומו

These charts reveal two things about LXX in comparison with MT. First, neither is more prone than the other to schematize. Second, the variations between MT and LXX are not theological, nor do they affect one's perception of any of the characters in the narrative.<sup>76</sup> On the contrary, although the variants are somewhat denser in these verses than elsewhere in the chapter, they appear rather trivial. Does some other explanation exist to explain the number of variations in these verses? A comparison with the texts of the gospels reveals that in parallel passages, scribes of one gospel often alter their texts in the direction of another of the Gospels (cf., e.g., Matt 17:1-9 and parallels in Mark and Luke, with eighteen variants attributed to contamination from other gospels in a space of nine verses; and Matt 13:1-9 and parallels from Mark and Luke, with fifteen such variants).<sup>77</sup> Thus, the sheer repetition in 1 Sam 3:4-10 may account for the variants (note also the variants in these verses that were not deemed preferable, many of which are based on similar verses in the section; see especially the Masoretic mss). Therefore, the data in 1 Samuel 3 does not support the existence of separate literary editions in MT and LXX, though it must be pointed out again that the data speaks only for the present chapter and not for any other chapter or for the book as a whole.

Which of the variants listed above are to be preferred then as the oldest variants, and on what basis? As noted previously (p. 218), the **אל** in the phrase **אל שמואל** in 3:4 MT may be the remnant of a missing **שמואל**, which is in fact present in LXX. In the second call, one could argue either that the missing **שמואל** in MT resulted from haplography or that the extra one in LXX resulted from dittography. Of these two choices, haplography is probably somewhat more likely, though no certainty can attach to such an evaluation. In the fourth call, a perusal of other occurrences of **כפעם כפעם** in the OT reveals that the phrase is generally used in order to avoid repetition. However, MT contains precisely such repetition. It is probable, then, that the omission of **שמואל שמואל** in LXX is the older reading. In fact, it is possible that the two-fold repetition of the name in verse 10 MT supports the two-fold repetition in verses 4 and 6, though not

<sup>76</sup>Thus, Walters's contention that LXX presents some characters differently from MT finds no support in chapter 3, though, of course, his evaluation of chapter 1 is not thereby negated.

<sup>77</sup>The statistics are taken from Kurt Aland, ed., *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, 13th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1985), 236-39, 174-75.

much weight can be attributed to this argument.

In the variants related to Eli's command and Samuel's response, it is LXX (or rather its *Vorlage*) that seems to be schematizing. It has been determined already that schematization is not characteristic of LXX in the chapter, but some harmonization between verses is not ruled out. The three-fold **שׁוֹב שׁוֹב שׁוֹב** in LXX contrasts with the pattern **שׁוֹב שׁוֹב שׁוֹב**, **שׁוֹב שׁוֹב שׁוֹב**, **שׁוֹב שׁוֹב שׁוֹב** in MT. MT also reads **וַיִּלֶךְ** twice in the three calls, whereas LXX does so only once, in the third call, which is separated from the command **שׁוֹב שׁוֹב** by several words. In these units of variation, the readings of MT are preferable.

### Conclusions

Before the textual decisions are presented in the form of a critical text in the next chapter, a few general conclusions may be drawn from the data. First, no single witness contains an overwhelming majority of older readings, though, in general terms, it is clear that MT and LXX are the most important witnesses to the text in this chapter. In fact, LXX is preferred to MT more often than vice versa when they are in conflict. A comparison of MT with each of the other witnesses yields interesting results. In Chart 3, the significant variants in the other witnesses are compared one by one with MT on the basis of which reading was taken to be preferable. The first column contains the number of times that the witness other than MT was preferred when the two conflicted, and the second contains the number of times MT was preferred. In addition to abbreviations discussed earlier, cj will be used for conjectures (the figure in the cj row is the number of conjectures accepted; no comparative data from MT is given).

**CHART 3**  
Comparison of MT with Other Witnesses

	Other Witness	MT
LXX	20	13
P	0	10
T	3	1
V	1	0
LXX <sup>L</sup>	0	2
LXX <sup>O</sup>	1	4
OPH	0	3
mss	2	27
tiq soph	1	0
4QSam <sup>a</sup>	1	1
cj	1	NA

A second conclusion arrived at on the basis of an analysis of the data is that witnesses generally regarded as of little importance for textual criticism do sometimes have superior readings. Nowhere is this fact more obvious than in verse 15, where the reading of LXX<sup>O</sup>, supported in part by LXX<sup>L</sup>, was chosen over that of MT. Both T and V occasionally have superior readings, though, perhaps surprisingly, P does not. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is too fragmentary in the chapter to be of much use, but one reading supported by this ms was preferred over MT. The twenty-seven times that Ms B19<sup>a</sup> (L, reflected in *BHS*) prevails over the other Masoretic mss evaluated in this study shows the quality of B19<sup>a</sup>, but the two times that the other mss have the better reading are reminders that *BHS* is not equivalent to MT. Finally, the importance of considering conjectures is stressed by the preference for one of them in verse 13.

One last conclusion should be noted. The usefulness of external evidence in evaluating readings was discussed above, where it was concluded that internal evidence should receive primary consideration. However, external evidence continues to play some role in textual decisions, particularly when internal evidence fails or is ambiguous. Thus, if two equally acceptable readings are found in MT, LXX, P, and T on the one hand, and another in LXX<sup>L</sup> on the other, the reading of those witnesses that generally bear witness to an older text will take priority. This contention is particularly true when the divergent witness is one of the Masoretic mss.